

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are pending. By this Preliminary Amendment, Claim 8 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Claims 1-3 and 5 are amended, and Claims 9-12 are added. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the originally filed application. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

The Final Office Action dated July 3, 2007 rejected Claims 1-3 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,529,260 to Sogard; and rejected Claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,602,349 to Chandra. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reason(s).

Claim 1 recites a substrate processing apparatus including a chamber having a container and an upper lid for closing an opening of the container, wherein the upper lid includes an electron beam irradiating part disposed in a center thereof; and an elevator for moving the upper lid, wherein ***the elevator includes a driving source mounted on and moving together with the upper lid, the driving source outputting a driving force to move the upper lid.***

Similarly, Claim 11 recites a substrate processing apparatus including a chamber having a container and an upper lid for closing an opening of the container; and a motor, mounted on and moving together with the upper lid, the motor rotating the a first tubular member inserted onto and threadably engaged with a first threaded pole about the first threaded pole.

Applicants respectfully submit that the art of record, i.e., Sogard and U.S. Patent Number 6,602,349 to Chandra et al. (Chandra) do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest each and every one of the features recited by Claims 1 and 11.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Sogard and Chandra fail to disclose, teach or suggest a driving source (Claim 1) or motor (Claim 11) mounted on and moving together with the upper lid of their respective apparatuses.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every feature of a rejected claim must be disclosed by a cited prior art reference.

As explained above, Sogard and Chandra each fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claims 1 and/or 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Sogard or Chandra.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 11 should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-7 and 9-10 depend from Claim 1. Claim 12 depends from Claim 11. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable at least for the same reason(s) Claims 1 and 11, respectively, are allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-7 and 9-12 and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Prompt and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107350.00008.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP


Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

MO/elp